Amendments to the Drawings

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs 1-3 and 8. Figs. 1-3 and 8 now include labels.

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 1, 3 and 5-9, and cancels claims 2 and 4. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 1, 3 and 5-9.

Specification

Applicants amended the specification to correct minor typographical errors. Applicants submit that these amendments do not add any new matter.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because Figs. 1-3 and 8 do not include "LABELS". The Examiner has amended Figs. 1-3 and 8 to include "LABELS". Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As discussed above, claims 2 and 4 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection regarding claims 2 and 4 is rendered moot. Regarding the remaining claims 1, 3 and 5-9, it should be noted that claims 1, 3 and 5-9 are now directed to a system comprising hardware (a computer) that implements the features of the claimed invention.

With regard to claims 6-8, this rejection is traversed for the following reasons. A method claim is statutory if the method requires use of hardware to accomplish any of the steps of the method. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 6-8, to more clearly recite that claims 6-8 are directed to a method

that requires the use of hardware (a computer) to accomplish steps of the claimed invention.

Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §112 Rejections

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claim 1, fully complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Therefore, this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0061201 to Grefenstette, et al. ("Grefenstette"). As discussed above, claims 2 and 4 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection regarding claims 2 and 4 is rendered moot. This rejection regarding the remaining claims 1, 3 and 5-9 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in claims 1, 3 and 5-9, are not taught or suggested by Grefenstette, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Specifically, amendments were made to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a job guidance and assistance system and method as recited, for example, in independent claims 1 and 6.

The present invention, as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6, provides a job guidance and assistance system and method for guiding and assisting a job of producing a document. The system includes a referring record database, a referring record searcher, a document production record searcher, a similarity estimator, and a computer. The computer is programmed to store in the referring record database a relationship formed between a document to be produced and a reference material, which is referred to for producing the document. The computer is also programmed to search for the relationship between the document to be produced and the reference material, which is stored in the referring record database, by using the referring record searcher. The computer is further programmed to search for a reference relationship between the document and the reference material, by using the document production record searcher. Furthermore, the computer is programmed to form the relationship, by using the similarity estimator, wherein the relationship is based on a comparison of at least one word appearing in the document to be produced and the reference document, a comparison of categories of the document to be produced and the reference document, and a comparison of a referring time or a referring frequency of the

11

document to be produced and the reference document. The prior art does not disclose all these features.

The above described features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims, are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record, particularly Grefenstette, whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

Grefenstette discloses a system for enriching the content of a meta-document. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Grefenstette of the job guidance and assistance system method of the present invention, as recited in the claims.

Grefenstette's system for enriching the content of a meta-document is illustrated in Fig. 3. As shown, the meta-document includes document content and personalities that describe enrichment themes. With user-settable constraints, the system is adapted to automatically determine whether to propagate enrichment between documents using an interaction history. In addition, the system is adapted to automatically determine the form that a markup is to take in the document content.

One feature of the present invention, as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claim 6, includes a computer programmed to form a relationship, where the relationship is based on a comparison of at least one word appearing in the document to be produced and the reference document, a comparison of categories of the document to be produced and the reference document, and a comparison of a referring time or a referring frequency of the document to be produced and the

12

reference document. Grefenstette does not disclose this feature. To support the assertion that Grefenstette discloses this feature, the Examiner cites paragraphs [0254], [0245], and [0303]-0305] (see page 6, paragraph 14 of the Office Action). However, neither the cited text nor any other portions of Grefenstette teach or suggest a computer programmed to form the relationship, based on a comparison of at least one word appearing in the document to be produced and the reference document, a comparison of categories of the document to be produced and the reference document, and a comparison of a referring time or a referring frequency of the document to be produced and the reference document, in the manner claimed.

Therefore, Grefenstette fails to teach or suggest a computer programmed to "form the relationship, by using the similarity estimator, wherein the relationship is based on a comparison of at least one word appearing in the document to be produced and the reference document, a comparison of categories of the document to be produced and the reference document, and a comparison of a referring time or a referring frequency of the document to be produced and the reference document" as recited in claim 1, and as similarly recited in claim 6.

Therefore, Grefenstette fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention, as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(a) rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5-9 are respectfully requested.

13

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference used in the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 5-9.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3 and 5-9 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 1, 3 and 5-9 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of Mattingly, Stanger, Malur & Brundidge, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (referencing attorney docket no. 520.42960X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

Donna K. Mason
Registration No. 45,962

DKM/sdb
(703) 684-1120

Attachments: Annotated Marked-Up Drawings

14